

# BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room April 13, 2016 1:00 P.M. Meeting Minutes

### APRIL 13, 2016 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

**HDRB Members Present:** Stephen Merriman, Jr., Chair

Zena McClain, Esq., Parliamentarian

Justin Gunther

Dr. Nicholas Henry Andy McGarrity Tess Scheer

Dr. Robin Williams

HDRB Members Not Present: Debra Caldwell

Keith Howington Ebony Simpson

**MPC Staff Present:** Tom Thomson, Executive Director

Ellen Harris, Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

Leah G. Michalak, Historic Preservation Planner

Sara Farr, Historic Preservation Planner Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant

#### I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. Call to Order and Welcome

#### II. SIGN POSTING

### III. CONSENT AGENDA

2. Petition of Lawrence Raymond Daiss III | 15-006543-COA | 317B West Broughton Street | Sign

Attachment: <u>Staff Report.pdf</u>
Attachment: <u>Submittal Packet.pdf</u>

### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a principal use projecting sign for the new 2nd floor business to be located at 317B West Broughton Street with the following conditions because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

- 1. Raise the sign and bracket 3 additional feet to provide 10 feet of clearance above the sidewalk as required by the sign ordinance.
- 2. Ensure that the new attachment for the bracket, when the bracket is raised 3 feet as required by the sign ordinance, that the gentlest means possible is used to attach it to the historic brick material; ensure that the bolts go through the mortar and not the brick faces.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry Second: Tess Scheer

Justin Gunther- AyeNicholas Henry- AyeZena McClain, Esq.- AyeAndy McGarrity- AyeStephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.- AbstainTess Scheer- AyeRobin Williams- Aye

3. Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 6 East State Street | 16-001641-COA | Sign

Attachment: Staff Recommendation.pdf

Attachment: Final Colors.pdf
Attachment: Final Design.pdf

## **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for a projecting principal use sign at 6 East State Street with the following conditions:

- 1. All new tenant panels are approved by staff; PASS
- 2. The sign is mounted only into the mortar;
- 3. The temporary banners are removed;

because otherwise the work meets the standards and is visually compatible.

**Vote Results** 

Motion: Nicholas Henry Second: Tess Scheer

Justin Gunther- AyeNicholas Henry- AyeZena McClain, Esq.- AyeAndy McGarrity- AyeStephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.- AbstainTess Scheer- AyeRobin Williams- Aye

## 4. <u>Petition of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects | 16-001648-COA | 660 East Broughton Street |</u> Amendments to Previous COA

Attachment: Staff Recommendation 16-001648-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - 660 East Broughton Street 16-001648-COA.pdf

#### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for amendments to the addition to the Kehoe Machine Shop to include changing the previously approved green roof at the northwest corner of the building to a raised terrace, the addition of guardrails to enclose - PASS portions of the terrace which match previously approved guardrails in other portions of the project, and the addition of ipe wood planters to help to enclose the terrace; because the project is visually compatible and meets the standards.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry Second: Tess Scheer

Justin Gunther- AyeNicholas Henry- AyeZena McClain, Esq.- AyeAndy McGarrity- AyeStephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.- AbstainTess Scheer- AyeRobin Williams- Aye

## 5. Petition of Twila Davis | 16-001667-COA | 526 East Harris Street | Alterations and Additions

Attachment: <u>Staff Recommendation.pdf</u>
Attachment: Final Submittal Package.pdf

#### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for two porch additions, alterations, and repairs at 526 East Harris Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

- 1. Colors are provided for the porches;
- 2. A sample of the proposed screening is provided;
- 3. The height of the carriage house porch railing is PASS reduced to a maximum of 36 inches;
- 4. The porch roof fascia are parallel to the exterior walls of the building, not angled;
- 5. The columns capital extend outward of the porch architrave;

Because otherwise the work meets the standards and is visually compatible.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry Second: Tess Scheer

Justin Gunther- AyeNicholas Henry- AyeZena McClain, Esq.- AyeAndy McGarrity- AyeStephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.- AbstainTess Scheer- AyeRobin Williams- Aye

### 6. Petition of Lynch Associates Architects 607 Abercorn Street 16-001684-COA Alterations

Attachment: <u>Staff Recommendation.pdf</u>
Attachment: Submittal Package.pdf

Attachment: Specification - Corner Tread.pdf
Attachment: Specification - Stair Riser.pdf
Attachment: Specification - Stair Tread.pdf

#### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for amendments to 14-003505-COA for 607 Abercorn Street, including cast iron stairs, a garden wall, and awnings with the condition that the canvas awning material is provided for staff approval, because otherwise the work meets the standards and is visually compatible.

**Vote Results** 

Motion: Nicholas Henry Second: Tess Scheer

Justin Gunther- AyeNicholas Henry- AyeZena McClain, Esq.- AyeAndy McGarrity- AyeStephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.- AbstainTess Scheer- AyeRobin Williams- Aye

### IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

## 7. Adoption of Agenda for April 13, 2016 Meeting

#### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review

does hereby adopt the April 13, 2016 Meeting - PASS

Agenda.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq. Second: Andy McGarrity

Justin Gunther - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Andy McGarrity - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain
Tess Scheer - Aye
Robin Williams - Not Present

## V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### 8. Approve March 9, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Attachment: <u>03-09-2016 Minutes.pdf</u>

## **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the meeting minutes of March - PASS 9, 2016.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Tess Scheer Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Justin Gunther	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

## VI. ITEM(S) REQUESTED TO BE REMOVED FROM THE FINAL AGENDA

#### VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

9. <u>Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 15-001384-COA | 600 East Bay Street | New Construction: Part II, Design Details</u>

#### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition as requested.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Tess Scheer Second: Nicholas Henry

Justin Gunther - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Andy McGarrity - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain
Tess Scheer - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

10. <u>Petition of Dawson Architects | 15-006113-COA | 321 Montgomery Street | New Construction:</u> Part II, Design Details

#### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition to the meeting of - PASS May 11, 2016 as requested.

## **Vote Results**

Motion: Tess Scheer Second: Nicholas Henry

Justin Gunther - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

### 11. Petition of Ryan Benjamin Kelly | 16-001156-COA | 111 East President Street | Signs

### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition as requested.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Tess Scheer Second: Nicholas Henry

Justin Gunther - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Andy McGarrity - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain
Tess Scheer - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

## 12. <u>Petition of Ken Brown | 16-001649-COA | 615 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | Alterations and Additions</u>

### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition as requested.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Tess Scheer Second: Nicholas Henry

Justin Gunther- AyeNicholas Henry- AyeZena McClain, Esq.- AyeAndy McGarrity- AyeStephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.- AbstainTess Scheer- AyeRobin Williams- Aye

## VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

13. <u>Petition of City Market Partners Unlimited | 16-001647-COA | 219 West St. Julian Street | New Foot Bridge in City Market</u>

Attachment: <u>Staff Report.pdf</u>
Attachment: <u>Submittal Packet.pdf</u>

Mr. Bryan Harder was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for alterations and additions for a portion of the City Market public area and for the building located at 219 West St. Julian Street. A new footbridge will be constructed from north to south across the center of the area open to the basement level below. It will extend from the existing clock tower location to the double-entry doors on the building at 219 West St. Julian Street. It will be 5 feet wide at the door and expand in width as it stretches north toward the clock tower; there will be two steps near the doors. The deck will be constructed from close mesh steel bar grate in black. The steps will be diamond plate stair treads and risers in black and the new railings will match the adjacent steel railings in black. They will be 42 inches high. The sign for the basement level business will be relocated to be attached to the existing railings near the double-entry doors. The swing of the double-entry door into 219 West St. Julian Street will be reversed; they will be recessed 4 inches from the exterior face of the building.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval of the alterations and additions for a portion of the City Market public area and for the building located at 219 West St. Julian Street as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

#### PETITIONER COMMENTS

**Mr. Harder** stated that staff requested a sample of the bar grading for the bridge. He as given staff a sample of the bar grading. He explained that their request for door alterations is only that the hinges be replaced with bigger hinges so that the doors will be able to open 180 degrees. The doors swing out currently and will still swing outward.

Mr. McGarrity asked the petitioner where the new brick paver border will be located.

**Mr. Harder** explained that a brick curve goes around the entire opening. Their intent is to cut into that as needed and salvage what they can. They will cut this flush.

Mr. Gunther asked if the grading change is to make the new bridge fully ADA accessible.

**Mr. Harder** answered no. He explained that an accessible path is already on one side of the opening. A ramp is here already. The access is purely for convenience. The grading is accessible and handrails will be at the steps.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board believes that the alterations and additions are a great idea. Mr. Gunther believes it would be better if a new ramp was added that would be fully accessible to everyone.

#### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for alterations and additions for a portion of the City Market public area and for the building located at 219 West St. Julian Street as requested because the proposed - PASS work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Tess Scheer Second: Andy McGarrity

Justin Gunther - Aye Nicholas Henry - Aye Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye Andy McGarrity - Ave Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain **Tess Scheer** - Ave **Robin Williams** - Aye

## 14. Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 16-001662-COA | 611 East River Street | Revised Rooftop Lighting

Attachment: Staff Recommendation 16-001662-COA.pdf

Attachment: Application - 611 East River Street 16-001662-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - Cover Letter.pdf Attachment: Submittal Packet- Drawings.pdf

## **Mr. Patrick Shay** was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to revise the rooftop lighting and trellis structure at 611 East River Street, the Homewood Suites. The project has been revised to remove 14 of the 16 light poles previously installed, and the trellis has been revised to incorporate the light fixtures and raise the center portion an additional four feet. The additional height is necessary to meet electric code. She said that 611 East River Street was approved by the Historic District Board of Review in June 2013 (H-120719-4727-2) and has been revised several times. The location and shape of the pool as well as the existing trellis was revised and approved in September 2013 (13-004367-COA).

**Ms. Harris** explained that the addition of the light fixtures was prompted by the Chatham County Health Department Guidelines for Pools (Section 290-5-57-.12 Lighting and Electrical Requirements) which states:

- (1) Artificial lighting shall be provided for all indoor and outdoor pools and pas. Lighting shall be adequate to illuminate the entire swimming pool enclosure without glare. All installations shall comply with local building code requirements. Ground-fault interrupters must be provided. Lighting in dressing rooms, sanitary facilities, equipment rooms and concessions shall comply with local code requirements.
  - a. For outdoor pools used for night swimming and all indoor pools and spas, a minimum of 30 foot candles shall be maintained at the surface of pool and deck areas where underwater lighting is utilized. A minimum of 50 foot candles shall be maintained at the surface of pool and deck areas where underwater lighting is not utilized. More light may be required as deemed necessary by the Health Authority and/or by other codes which apply.

**Ms. Harris** stated that a similar petition which included the installation of 16, 20-foot tall light fixtures on the rooftop was denied by the HDBR on March 9, 2016 (16-000849-COA) because it was determined that the light fixtures were not visually compatible in height or scale. At the meeting, the Board discussed several alternatives which included revising the existing trellis to include some or all of the light fixtures. The proposed revised design incorporates the Board's suggestions.

**Ms. Harris** said at the last meeting a discussion was held about the tent structures that are also on the rooftop. She said the rooftop tent structures are not a part of this petition. This will be discussed at a later time. Some proposed revisions to the ordinance will be discussed at the end of this meeting today. Therefore, the only things before the Board today are the revised trellis and the two proposed light fixtures.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval of the revised light fixture and trellis design on the rooftop of 611 East River Street because the revised design is visually compatible and meets the standards.

**Ms. McClain** asked staff if the trellis will be raised to the height of the light fixtures.

**Ms. Harris** explained that they will be less of the light fixtures. The light fixtures are 20 feet tall and the trellis will be raised to 16 feet tall. However, the trellis will only be raised in the middle portion.

## **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Shay** stated that he did not have anything to add to the staff's report. He entertained questions from the Board.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that they understood all the factors involved in this petition and recognize the petitioner's efforts to find a solution. However, the HSF does not agree that the proposal is visually compatible. They believe that the light poles that will remain and the height of the trellis are too tall. Although the height is mitigated in views from the immediate rights-of-way, they feel it will be highly visual from other points as shown in some of the photos that were included in the last submittal.

**Mr. Shay**, in response to the public comments, wanted to remind the Board that the trellis was previously approved. Other than the raising of the center section to mitigate the situation with the required lighting, it is not before the Board today.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Gunther** stated that he agrees with HSF comments; however, the Board previously approved the trellis. He believes what they have today is an acceptable compromise. This greatly reduces the visual clutter that is currently here. The Board discussed that one of the realities they will have to face will be new challenges of the activation of the rooftop space. But for time time, there is not much in the way of guidelines. Therefore, this is a good solution. Ms. McClain stated that the trellis was approved at its present height of 12 feet. But, today the trellis is proposed to be raised. She said they are setting a precedent because they do not know what effect this will have with the surrounding properties, the growth, and the other hotels as they are built. The Board felt, however, that the trellis is a drastic improvement from the last time it was before them and is a reasonable solution to the issue that is before them today.

#### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the revised light fixture and trellis design on the rooftop of-PASS 611 East River Street because the revised design is visually compatible and meets the standards.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Andy McGarrity Second: Nicholas Henry

Justin Gunther- AyeNicholas Henry- AyeZena McClain, Esq.- AyeAndy McGarrity- AyeStephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.- AbstainTess Scheer- AyeRobin Williams- Aye

## 15. <u>Petition of Hansen Architects | 16-001665-COA | 457-459 Tattnall Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass</u>

Attachment: Staff Report.pdf

Attachment: Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - Drawings and Photographs.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - Mass Model.pdf

Attachment: Aerial.pdf

Attachment: C03-LAYOUT-457&459TATTNALL-040816.pdf

Attachment: Tattnall St Existing Conditions Photos.pdf

Mr. Eric Puljung was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 3-story duplex with a 2-story duplex carriage house for the vacant properties located at 457 and 459 Tattnall Street. The proposed buildings are located on the newly subdivided parcels on the southern portion of the block between Tattnall and Jefferson (east and west) and Alice and West Gaston Street (north and south).

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 3-story duplex with a 2-story carriage house for the vacant properties located at 457 and 459 Tattnall Street with the following conditions to be submitted for review by the Board with Part II, Design Details because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

- 1. Staff recommends that the roof shape be revised to be more compatible with the main building and to meet the carriage house roof standard which requires the roof to be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by a parapet.
- 2. Ensure that the door frames are inset not less than three (3) inches from the exterior surface of the façade of the building.
- 3. Add lower rails to all balusters and railings.
- 4. Revise the carriage house siding to be a material that is more compatible with the main building's brick material.
- 5. Ensure that the window sashes are inset not less than three (3) inches from the exterior surface of the façade of the building.
- 6. On the site plan:
  - Indicate that the garage sloped aprons are not located on the public right-ofway.
  - Indicate that each curb cut does not exceed 20 feet in width.
  - Indicate that the sidewalk is a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.
  - Indicate the proposed refuse storage areas for the carriage house.

### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Puljung** thanked the staff for their review and comments on the project. He explained that the jambs on the doors and windows are 5 1/8 inches recessed from the face of the brick, but within the opening, exterior trimming will be applied to the jamb. Therefore, they will be 3 5/8 inches setback. This is true for the doors and windows. They will ensure that this is included in the design details section.

**Mr. Puljung** said regarding their civil drawings, they have worked closely with the Storm and Drainage Department concerning the 25 year flood issue. They want to be a little above the top of the curb, therefore, they are looking at approximately two inches above this for the garage slab. A roll curb is being proposed. Therefore, there will not be a physical cut into the curb. A four foot wide sidewalk at the curb is being proposed at the curb line and any balance that needs to occur of the slope will occur between the sidewalk and the garage door.

**Mr. Puljung** said regarding the refuse storage areas, their thought was that this will be a single metered property. Therefore, their they were going on the assumption that they

would have one trash and one recycle container. If there is a need for additional containers, a space is between the garage doors where they could place the containers inside the garage.

**Mr. Puljung** said regarding adding lower rails to all balusters and railings, is definitely what they plan to show the Board in Part II - Design and Details. Today, they were only trying to show the Board in Part I - Height and Mass that they will have rails; however, at this point they have not been designed. But, they will have a bottom rail.

Mr. Puljung stated that regarding the carriage house and their desire to use siding on this building, he has gone through the ward. As the Board knows, Jefferson and Tattnall Streets are parallel to each other. Interestingly, though, as they go up and down either street there is a disconnect between what is seen on Tattnall Street and what is seen on Jefferson Street. There is not a large amount of similarity between Tattnall Street and Jefferson Street construction. There appears to be a visual break between the two streets. The images he has help to document this fact. Mr. Puljung said 521 and 523 Tattnall Street is a new construction project. A variety of materials are used here where you can see how the massing relates. He showed a view north of Jefferson Street which touches the edge of this project. A small ancillary structure is built behind the cottage. On the front is a one and half story double cottage. Mr. Puljung showed the Board more images of structures within this area where mixed materials were used.

**Mr. Puljung** pointed out two structures, 206 and 208 West Gaston Lane, which are cottage structures behind masonry construction. He said going towards Barnard Street, a high stoop building is here with mixed materials; on Tattnall Street of stucco and brick. The ancillary structure is new construction with mixed materials. He believes this is a similar aesthetic to what they are doing with a larger mass facing Tattnall Street and a smaller structure towards Jefferson Street.

Mr. Puljung explained that they were trying to do new construction and infill that would not be so massive. But, with studying the carriage house in brick, they found it to be a lot more volume and could create a bigger presence on that block. Therefore, they decided to use siding on this building. They found out further that it created a little more texture for the courtyard space which the occupant would enjoy. Therefore, they believed this would be a good idea. The roof form that they have chosen is a hip roof. The roof form definitely responds to what is in the area. As two adjacent structures next to them have hip roofs, they thought the hip roof would be a sympathetic approach in form to match what is here. They were trying to pull back the massing. He imagines that the ordinance not suggesting a hip roof on a carriage house is to preserve the setback lines so water would not drain into the adjacent property. Mr. Puljung said, however, they are actually more than five feet off each sides of the setback. They can actually manage their stormwater collection. They like the idea of keeping the roof different from the main house. They also like keeping the siding because of the reasons he has stated which are to break up the massing and continue with the diversity of the materials that they see on Jefferson Street.

**Ms. McClain** said the petitioner did not show any carriage houses where the material is different from the main structure. The petitioner showed houses that back up to houses.

**Mr. Puljung** said he did not show a specific carriage house. They have, within their ward, the historic precedence of different materials behind a masonry building. They can see on a

tithing lot that was a precedent in Barring Ward for a different type of construction behind the building. He agrees that Jefferson Street has a lane and/or a service side versus Tattnall Street being the primary façade which is not the same as a tithing lot. The idea of breaking down the massing with a change in the materials was developed. They also believe that the siding material is more contextual to what is seen on Jefferson Street and the variety of construction they see along Jefferson and Tattnall Streets.

**Mr. Merriman** asked staff if the ordinance states that the main house matches the carriage house.

Ms. Michalak answered that there is not a specific design standard that states that. No.

**Ms. McClain** stated, however, in terms of visual compatibility, you look at the contributing structures and this is why the staff report is written as it is because the main house and the carriage house are being compared together. The pictures that the petitioner showed were individual houses and not carriage houses attached to a main structure.

**Ms. Scheer** asked what defines this as a carriage house versus it being called another structure.

**Ms. Michalak** answered it is basically because it is a garage and an apartment. If it was something else, they would probably call it a lane dwelling or a rear dwelling.

**Dr.** Williams applauds the petitioner for orienting the building the way he has, recognizing the historical pattern of housing facing Tattnall Street although it is on the corner of Gaston Street. However, he has looked at the aerial view in this area and he could not find a single residence historic or new on this street, with maybe the structure on Jones Street as the exception as it has a carriage house behind the house. He asked the petitioner how he arrived at having a carriage house.

**Mr. Puljung** stated he believes it is modern function. People need to park their cars and have garages. This is new construction and they are trying to meet all the needs of the potential owners. It is a big demand to have off-street parking. If the Board looks at the carriage house dimensions that they have provided, they have actually reduced this to the minimum depth that they can accommodate a normal vehicle. They are not trying to supersize the garage.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said that there has been a lot of conversation about the carriage house. The HSF agrees with staff that they think the main house and the carriage house should have a similar roof shape and building materials. They recognize all of the examples that the petitioner has provided, but some of the examples where they see the difference on Jefferson Street, Tattnall Street and the difference in materiality on the same blocks may have something to do with the fact that these buildings were built at different times. This is the reason why they push to have the carriage house be a similar material to the main house. The two buildings in fact relate to each other. Therefore, this is the motivation for trying to keep them similar. In this case it is the material and the roof shape. This does not mean that the carriage house has to be brick if this is what the main house will be. However, they believe that masonry stucco and other

things that will work better than brick versus wood siding.

**Ms. Meunier** said she lives in a carriage house and the staircases are on the ends, but on the interior. There are two garage doors and a front door that leads, with stairs, up to the main house. Therefore, this would widen the mass of the structure. She does not believe that increasing the massing this way would be negative, but would mirror the main structure. They believe it would be more appropriate to incorporate windows on the north façade simply because there does not appear to be a reason not to put windows there. Therefore, they prefer to see windows on this façade instead of having a blank façade on the main house.

**Ms. Meunier** said the lintels are vertical bricks and they believe the bricks should extend beyond the jamb of the window opening and present the proper masonry structure and should be angled versus vertical bricks. This is a recommendation for study in Part II - Design Details.

**Ms. Laura E. Forseea of 217 Alice Street** stated she was present regarding the HSF's recommendation of adding windows to the side of the building. Ms. Foreseea said the windows would be directly into her patio, courtyard space and bedroom. This would be a huge intrusion.

**Mr. Puljung**, in response to the public comments, said the north façade is not setback from the property line. This is a fire rating concern. This why they do not have openings. They have tried to be mindful of expressing the façade, but when they basically have a zero setback, to have glass in that wall would be a big feat to make it work. He said regarding the HSF's comments regarding the materials on the carriage house, he feels strongly about the idea of it being a different material than the main house just for a relief in texture. Mr. Puljung said he would be happy to study something else with the Board if he needs, too.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed that the carriage house needs to be restudied. The carriage house siding material needs to be restudied to be more compatible with the main building's brick material. The stair locations need to be restudied with regards to the overall mass of the building. The carriage house roof shape needs to be restudied to be more compatible with the main building and to meet the carriage house roof standard which requires the roof to be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by a parapet. The Board also discussed that the stair locations need to be restudied with regard to the overall mass of the building. The lintel design needs to be restudied and the false windows on the north side should be removed.

The Board agreed that both Parts I and II for the carriage house could be submitted for review at the next meeting.

### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby:

1. Approve New Construction: Part I, Height and

Mass for a 3-story duplex main building on the vacant properties located at 457 and 459 Tattnall Street with the following conditions to be submitted for review by the Board with Part II, Design Details because the main building is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

- a. Ensure that the door frames are inset not less than three (3) inches from the exterior surface of the façade of the building.
- b. Add lower rails to all balusters and railings.
- c. Ensure that the window sashes are inset not less than three (3) inches from the exterior surface of the façade of the building.
- d. On the site plan:
  - Indicate that the garage sloped aprons are not located on the public right-ofway.
  - Indicate that the each curb cut does not exceed 20 feet in width.
  - Indicate that the sidewalk is a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.
  - Indicate the proposed refuse storage PASS areas for the carriage house.
- e. Restudy the lintel design.
- f. Remove the false windows on the north façade.
- 2. Restudy the proposed New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a 2-story carriage house on the vacant properties located at 457 and 459 Tattnall Street with the following conditions to be submitted for review by the Board with Part II, Design Details as follows:
  - a. Restudy the carriage house roof shape to be more compatible with the main building and to meet the carriage house roof standard which requires the roof to be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by a parapet.
  - b. Restudy the carriage house siding to be a material that is more compatible with the main building's brick material.
  - c. Restudy the stair locations with regard

to the overall mass of the building.

 The Board also stated that both Parts I and II for the carriage house can be submitted for review at the next meeting.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Justin Gunther - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Andy McGarrity - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain
Tess Scheer - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

## IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

#### X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

16. <u>Petition of Jake King for Hansen Architects | 16-000731-COA | 214-218 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Color Change, Alterations, Awnings</u>

Attachment: COA - 214-218 West Broughton Street 16-000731-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - 214-218 West Broughton Street 16-000731-COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

17. <u>Petition of Margaret Lightsey | 16-001309-COA | 402 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Color Change</u>

Attachment: COA - 402 West Broughton Street 16-001309-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - 402 West Broughton Street 16-001309-COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

18. <u>Petition of Billy Bremer | 16-001377-COA | 408 East Liberty Street | Staff Approved - Pressure Wash and Brick Repointing</u>

Attachment: COA - 408 East Liberty Street 16-001377-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - 408 East Liberty Street 16-001377-COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

## 19. <u>Petition of Joshua Beckler for Coastal Canvas Products | 16-001414-COA | 417 East River Street | Staff Approved - Awnings</u>

Attachment: COA - 417 East River Street 16-001414-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packe - 417 East River Street 16-001414-COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

## 20. Petition of Austin Hill for Austin Hill Realty, LLC | 16-001418-COA | 417 Whitaker Street | Staff Approved - Color Change

Attachment: COA - 417 Whitaker Street 16-001418-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - 417 Whitaker Street 16-001418-COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

## 21. Petition of John Kern for Kern & Co., LLC | 16-001456-COA | 313 West River Street | Staff Approved - Brick Repairs and Repointing

Attachment: <u>Submittal Packet 1 - 313 West River Street 16-001456-COA.pdf</u>
Attachment: <u>Submittal Packet 2 - 313-321 West River Street 16-001456.pdf</u>
Attachment: <u>Submittal Packet 3 - 313-321 West River Street 16-001456-COA.pdf</u>

Attachment: COA - 313 West River Street 16-001456-COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

#### 22. Petition of Ralph Anderson | 16-001508 | 324 East Bryan Street | Staff Approved - Window

Attachment: COA - 324 East Bryan Street 16-001508-COA.pdf

Attachment: Updated information.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

#### 23. Petition of Andrew Dewitt | 16-001514-COA | 37 Whitaker Street | Staff Approved - Stucco

Attachment: COA - 37 Whitaker Street 16-001514-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - 37 Whitaker Street 16-001514-COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

#### 24. Petition of Gordon Taylor | 16-001516-COA | 15 East Jones Street | Staff Approved - Repair Work

Attachment: COA - 15 East Jones Street 16-001516-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - 15 East Jones Street 16-001516-COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

## 25. <u>Petition of Molly Neagle for Lowe's | 16-001536-COA | 518 East Perry Lane | Staff Approved - Windows</u>

Attachment: COA - 518 East Perry Lane 16-001536-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - 518 East Perry Lane 16-001536-COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

## 26. <u>Petition of Joshua Beckler for Coastal Canvas Products | 16-001537-COA | 18 East Broughton</u> Street | Staff Approved - Awnings

Attachment: COA - 18 East Broughton Street 16-001537-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - 18 East Broughton Street 16-001537-COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

## 27. <u>Petition of JDR Construction and Design | 16-001663-COA | 226 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Color Change</u>

Attachment: COA - 226 West Broughton Street 16-001663-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - 226 West Broughton Street 16-001663-COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

## 28. <u>Petition of Omar El-Khalidi for Sterling Builders & Restoration, Inc. | 16-001751-COA | 207 East Charlton Street | Staff Approved - Stucco Repair</u>

Attachment: COA - 207 East Charlton Street 16-001751-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - 207 East Charlton Street 16-001751-COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

## 29. <u>Petition of Joshua Beckler for Coastal Canvas Products | 16-001756-COA | 225 East River Street |</u> Staff Approved - Awnings

Attachment: COA - 225 East River Street 16-001756-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - 225 East River Street 16-001756-COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

## 30. <u>Amended Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 16-001793-COA | 570 East York Street | Staff Approved - Windows</u>

Attachment: COA - 570 East York Street 16-001793-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - 570 East York Street 16-001793-COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

### 31. Petition of Ralph Anderson | 16-001837-COA | 308 East State Street | Staff Approved - Windows

Attachment: COA - 308 East State Street 16-001837-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - 308 East State Street 16-001837-COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

## 32. <u>Petition of Gary Mitchell | 16-001840-COA | 215 East Gordon Street | Staff Approved - Doors and Repairs</u>

Attachment: COA - 215 East Gordon Street 16-001840-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - 215 East Gordon Street 16-001840-COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

## 33. <u>Petition of Samantha S. Sunkins for Beth Eden Baptist Church | 16-001842-COA | 302 East Gordon Street | Staff Approved - Windows</u>

Attachment: COA - 302 East Gordon Street 16-001842-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - 302 East Gordon Street 16-001842-COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

## 34. <u>Petition of Cassie Beckwith for Hansen Architects | 16-001873-COA | 6 East State Street | Staff Approved - Color Change</u>

Attachment: COA - 6 East State Street 16-001873-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - 6 East State Street 16-001873-COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

## 35. <u>Petition of Joshua Beckler for Coastal Canvas Products | 16-001881-COA | 226 West Broughton</u> Street | Staff Approved - Awning

Attachment: COA - 226 West Broughton Street 16-001881-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - 226 West Broughton Street 16-001881-COA Impeccable

Pig.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - Awning Color 226 West Broughton Street 16-001881-

COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

## 36. <u>Petition of Luis Burgos for Hansen Architects | 16-001892 | 109 West Broughton Street | Staff</u> Approved - Color Change

Attachment: COA - 109 West Broughton Street 16-001892-COA.pdf

Attachment: Paint Chips.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Package.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

## 37. <u>Amended Petition of Eric O'Neill for Greenline Architecture | 16-001997-COA | 241 Drayton</u> Street | Staff Approved - Rehabilitation and Alterations

Attachment: COA - 241 Drayton Street 16-001997-COA.pdf

Attachment: Submittal Packet - 241 Drayton Street 16-001997-COA.pdf

No action required. Staff approved.

#### XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

38. Report on Work Performed Without a Certificate of Appropriateness

Attachment: HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 4-13-16.pdf

#### XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

### XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

#### **Notices**

- 39. Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting Thursday, April 14, 2016 at 3:30 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street
- 40. Next Regular Meeting Wednesday, May 11, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street

#### XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

#### **Unfinished Business**

41. Review Proposed Revisions to the Historic District Ordinance

Attachment: 4-13-16 HDBR Version revised- for discussion.pdf

The Board continued their discussion on the proposed revisions to the Historic District Ordinance.

**Ms. Harris** informed the Board that in their attachment they will see that items underlined in red or blue are the items they have already discussed. The items highlighted in yellow are the new items they will discuss today.

**Ms. Harris** stated that at the last meeting, the Board discussed what constitutes a temporary structures, what constitutes a permanent structure, and how they are defined. The particular reference given was a proliferation of what they see as a tent-like canvas structures in various locations around town. It is difficult to define temporary structures in an all encompassing matter. The Board has been applying the visual compatibility criteria with these structures. In order to address these structures, she has added clarification on the awning section under definitions on page 4 which states that "A lightweight, exterior roof-like shade that typically projects over a window or door, usually made of canvas or similar fabric on a metal frame, also may be wood, plastic or metal. Awnings are attached to buildings, typically on a vertical surface. See also Shade Structures.

Ms. Harris explained that Shade Structures is a new definition and is listed on

page 9. <u>Shade Structures</u>. <u>Similar to awnings, shade structures are permanent, free standing structures intended to provide shade or shelter and are attached to the ground or horizontal surface of a building.</u>

Ms. Harris stated that definition for Temporary is on page 10. She explained that two sentences are used as a part of the "Temporary" definition. One sentence talks about what is a temporary structure and the other sentence essentially talks about what is not a temporary structure. She asked that the Board focus on the second sentence because she needs to meet with representatives at Development Services and work on the definition further. Ms. Harris said it might be a little premature for her to present this to the Board, but due to their comments she thought it might be helpful for them to look at the definition now. Temporary. For the purpose of requiring a Certificate of Appropriateness, any object, structure, sign, or fence for fewer than 60 days within a 12-month period, or timeframe otherwise agreed upon by the Preservation Officer. The object, structure, sign, or fence physically attached to a building, structure, or the ground for greater than 60 days within a 12-month period or the agreed upon timeframe shall be subject to the provisions of this ordinance.

The Board suggested that the second sentence read: The object, structure, sign, or fence physically attached to a building, structure or the ground for greater than 60 days within a 12-month period or the agreed upon timeframe shall be considered permanent and, therefore, subject to the provision of this ordinance.

Ms. Harris said the Awnings and Shade Structures are on page 29. As the Board is aware, they have a section on Awnings and they have somewhat been applying them to shade structures as well. It is not really an ideal comparison between the two. For example, with the Wesley Monumental case when the Review Board's decision was overturned by the Zoning Board of Appeals one of the arguments was that the standards that were being applied should not have been applied to these structures as they were not awnings. Therefore, this highlighted the need for further definition. Therefore, it is being revised to read: Awnings and shade structures shall be subject to the following criteria:

- a. Awnings <u>Installations</u> extending above the public right of way shall have a minimum vertical clearance of eight feet (8') above the sidewalk.
- b. Residential <u>awnings installations</u> shall be constructed of canvas, cloth or equivalent. Non-residential <u>awnings installations</u> shall be constructed of canvas, other equivalent cloth, metal, or glass.

**Ms. Harris** said she did not see a need presently to distinguish between what materials might be appropriate for an awning and a shade structure. As the Board knows, they have a policy regarding which awning fabric has been preapproved for awnings. This will also apply to shade structures. Basically, no vinyl is appropriate.

C. Awnings shall be integrated structurally and architecturally into the design of the façade and not obscure the character-defining features of historic facades.

- d. The following shall be prohibited:
  - i. A single continuous awing that connects two buildings.
  - ii. Back-lit or internally lit awnings.
- e <u>Awnings</u> Installations within the public right-of-way shall be required to obtain an encroachment license from the City of Savannah.
- **Ms.** Harris informed the Board that f, g, h, and i are new.
- f. Supports shall consist of metal or wood. PVC shall not be permitted.
- g. Ground mounted shade structures shall be located to the rear of the property or screened from view.
- h. Roof mounted shade structures shall be setback from all street fronting facades and minimally visible from streets.
- e-i. The maximum height of shade structures shall be 11 feet and the maximum area shall be 100 square feet on any property, unless specifically required by state law for playground equipment.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Shay** applauds the Board for revising the ordinance. The roofs of buildings in Savannah, especially at large scales are going to have activated spaces on the roofs because people love to go up on the roof and view the City of Savannah. If the roofs are done the right way they can be beautiful and actually enhance the architecture of the buildings. Mr. Shay said he believes they could enhance the perception of Savannah as a wonderful place to visit. 229 West Congress Street had a shed structure on the roof. He does not believe it will be built, but it got the Board's approval.

Mr. Shay said he cautions with "i" that they not limit the size of the structures to 100 square feet which is tiny. The standard for rooftop is supposed to be relaxed so that the trellis on the roof could be taller. He encouraged the Board to offer some kind of guidance as to what an appropriate roof structure might be. The John Wesley Hotel was sadly demolished for the SunTrust building on Johnson Square. It had a proud rooftop garden. There is a historic pattern that is out there for precedence, etc. In the Board's effort to try to eliminate ugly shade structures, Mr. Shay said he is hopeful that they would not eliminate all shade structures because factually they are a good enhancement.

**Mr. McGarrity** asked staff what is the projected completion date of the revisions.

**Ms. Harris** said there is still one large section in the ordinance that the Board needs to look at, which is the large scale development standards and will be presented at the May 11, 2016 meeting. At the June 8, 2016 meeting, maybe have an overall meeting to rap up everything, Then it will still take a process as they will have to go to the MPC for text amendments. The MPC would have to make a recommendation to City Council and they do not have control over that timeline. But, she believes the work of the

Review Board could be completed in June, 2016.

**Dr. Williams** stated he wonders if it would be worthwhile to see examples of shade structures that other cities have. He is sure that other cities have had this same issue and some historic cities have seen some interesting solutions.

**Dr. Henry** stated he believes it is a good idea in many ways to approach this holistic somewhat radical change. But, they might need to think more about incremental as there will be many concepts for roof changes. An incremental approach is not bad.

Mr. McGarrity said he cautioned the Board to take their time on Section 8. They need to be sure to get the proper input from the Historic Savannah Foundation. They may need to seek input from some of the design members in the community. Maybe they need an open forum/open collaboration to see what will make sense. As he sees it, it will relate to height and mass. There will still be objections, but he believes they can get a common denominator established for a starting point. Mr. McGarrity said he believes the rooftop issue will be one of their biggest issues over the next decade.

**Ms. Harris** explained that it is always helpful to have something on paper first to review. She suggested that the Board develops the revision to a point and then send notices to persons with the same interest inviting them to a roundtable discussion.

**Mr. Merriman** stated that all of these are based on things that they have come up against in the past few years. For example, for the playground at Wesley Monumental, they did not have standards to base their decision on. They based it on visual compatibility. Therefore, this is why it is important that they have something in the ordinance that they can go by. Something will always come up that will not fit and this is why they have the Zoning Board of Appeals. The Review Board has to start somewhere and he believes this is a good start.

**Ms. Scheer** said as Dr. Williams stated, things evolve. Therefore, the Board's definition of compatibility needs to evolve. They do have guidelines for compatibility, but in the end it is subjective.

**Mr. Gunther** asked how does the Board review shade structures from rooftop additions. Do they just consider rooftop additions and apply the same standards or do they have a completely different set of standards?

**Dr. Williams** stated he imagines shade structures reading as a cornice. It would extend out from a wall plane as opposed to a rooftop addition being contracted back. Who knows what architects may come up with?

Mr. Gunther said the measurements in "i" are too restrictive.

**Dr. Williams** said the 11 feet is not a bad idea, but he believes the square footage is too restrictive.

The Board suggested that "i" reads: The maximum height of shade structures shall be 11 feet.

Ms. Harris said on page 32 is the Tree Lawns and Tree Wells. She said, typically, this has been an item that has not been reviewed by the Board for things such as new construction, rehabilitation, etc. The staff has often suggested that under new construction projects, especially lately they have recommended that in areas of town that are being developed that do not include a tree lawn or tree well that this be incorporated into the site plan, even though it is reviewed by different departments. What is here now makes it a requirement. The idea behind this was developed through a Park & Tree Commissioner, Phil Coron, who is present at the meeting today and formed a committee of various citizens including City staff, MPC staff, representatives from the Tree Foundation and others to brainstorm ideas and come up with ways to require in the local historic districts the incorporation of tree lawns and tree wells where historically appropriate and where their is space. Of course, ADA accessibility is highly paramount in this.

Ms. Harris stated that the committee has worked on this more than a year and brainstormed different ideas about where would be the appropriate place to put this requirement. Would it be in the Tree Ordinance or some other ordinance? The committee came up with the idea that it could be triggered through the Certificate of Appropriateness process. This ordinance applies to the Landmark District, but similar language is being proposed in the other three local historic districts (Mid-City, Victorian, and Cuyler-Brownville).

#### (NEW SECTION)

(12) *Tree Lawns and Tree Wells.* The establishment and construction of a tree lawn or tree well is required when a property is developed or improved and shall comply with the following.

a. For any new construction, addition greater than 500 square feet, or rehabilitation

in which the value of the improvement is greater than 50% of the assessed

value

of the building, tree lawns or tree wells shall be established and/or restored

as

#### follows:

i Established when there is adequate space to ensure that an existing or proposed sidewalk is ADA accessible as provided in the ADA code

and

approved by Traffic Engineering.

ii. Restored when they exist historically or exist within the current

adjacent

context:

- iii. The size, placement, and configuration of the new tree lawn or tree well shall be based on the historic configuration and existing adjacent context;
- iv. Except as provided in ii above, the size of tree lawns shall be governed by the size standards established in the Tree Lawn Compliance and Policy Manual;
- v. Where space allows for a tree lawn of five feet or wider, and where on-street adjacent parking exists, a minimum one-foot wide curb-header shall be established which is parallel and adjacent to the curb;

vi. The minimum required width of a tree lawn is eighteen inches which may be approved only if space does not permit a wider tree lawn, or as provided in ii above. If space does not permit an eighteen-inch

<u>tree</u>

lawn, tree wells shall be established as an alternative. If space does

<u>not</u>

permit either tree lawns or tree wells, the development is exempt from these provisions.

- b. Historic paving material, curbs, markers, and other historic objects shall be preserved in situ. If temporary removal is necessary, the materials shall be reinstalled in the same location.
- c. All new tree lawns or tree well proposals shall be subject to Site Plan

Review

and shall be required to obtain an Encroachment License from the City

Savannah as specified in the Tree Lawn Compliance and Policy

of Manual.

d. The treatment of tree lawns shall be consistent with the **Tree Lawn** 

**Compliance** 

and Policy Manual and all other relevant City Ordinances including

the\_\_\_

Landscape and Tree Protection Ordinance (Sections 8-11011 through 8-11013). The process for approval and sources of documentation will be found in the Manual.

plans

e. The Director of the Park and Tree Department or designee shall review the

and configuration of all new tree lawns and tree wells and make a timely recommendation to the Historic District Board of Review for approval or denial.

**Ms. Harris** explained that pertaining to trellises being on rooftops, she has added a provision that says "Rooftop trellises may exceed 11 feet in height provided they are visually compatible."

**Ms. Harris** stated that the vehicle and pedestrian drop-off areas that they see on hotels, they have put in a provision that does not allow this within the footprint of the building or the primary façade as follows: g. Vehicle and pedestrian drop-off areas shall not be accommodated within the footprint of the building.

#### **New Business**

42. Appoint Nominating Committee

**Dr. Henry** congratulated Dr. Robin Williams along with the other authors on the publication of their book entitled **Buildings of Savannah**. He said that Dr.

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room April 13, 2016 1:00 P.M. Meeting Minutes

Williams introduced the entire program series on PBS last night. Dr. Henry stated that Dr. Williams made a great impression for Savannah.

**Dr. Williams** said a series of lectures will be held on April 20 - May 11, 2016, at the SCAD Museum of Art Theater at 601 Turner Boulevard, Savannah, GA, entitled "Reading the City." The lectures are free and open to the public.

\*\*\*

**Mr. Merriman** said that Ms. Wiebe-Reed has resigned from the Review Board as she is no longer in Savannah. Ms. Weibe-Reed is the Vice-Chair. Therefore, the Board needs to nominate someone to serve as Vice-Chair. He asked Dr. Henry, Ms. Scheer and Mr. Gunther to serve as the nominating committee.

## XV. ADJOURNMENT

#### 43. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Review Board, Mr. Merriman adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ms. Ellen Harris Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem